



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : November 18, 2003
Nepela : Art Unit 2832
Serial No. 09/648,006 : Examiner Karl Easthom
Filed: 08/03/1998 : Docket A26996D2

**METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS FOR OPTIMIZING INTERFACIAL
PROPERTIES OF MAGNETORESISTIVE SENSORS**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

Sir:

Please consider this response to the Office Action dated May 29, 2003.

REMARKS

Claims 7, 10, 14 and 15 are now under consideration. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 12, 20, 24, 38, 39, 47, 48, 56 and 98 are claims defining inventions that are independent and distinct and are obvious variants over one another. All of the claims which are related and linked should be examined together to expedite prosecution and so that piecemeal examination of the claims can be avoided. The examination of these claims in one application would ease the burden of examination and would avoid issues such as double patenting. A favorable decision on this request is respectfully requested.

Claims 53-55, 57-59, 61, 65, 67, 69-71, 83-85, 93-95, and 99-104 were allowed in application serial no. 08/702,977 and these claims constitute Claims 1-25 of Patent 5,793,279.

With respect to the non-statutory double patenting rejection and to the obviousness-type double patenting applied to Claim 7, Applicant invites the attention of the Examiner to MPEP section 804.01 which states that "where the Office requires restriction at the national stage, the patent of either the parent or any divisional application thereof conforming to the requirement cannot be used as a reference

RECEIVED
DEC 17 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800